



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,868	04/06/2001	Hironobu Sakaguchi	P20824	3212
7055	7590	12/30/2004	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				CHAMPAGNE, DONALD
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3622		

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/826,868	SAKAGUCHI, HIRONOBU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Donald L. Champagne	3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 3 and 8 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 9 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not entirely persuasive. The following new grounds of rejection address the arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was mad.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over LaPlante (Computerworld, 5 April 1999) in view of Hamano et al. (US 20020166127A1)
4. LaPlante teaches (independent claims 1, 6 and 10) a network system, a control method for a home appliance, and said appliance connected to a network, the network system comprising a network interconnecting at least one appliance (*refrigerator*) having a data output system (the refrigerator's *barcode scanner, communications port* and *Internet connection*, p. 52 col. 3-4) that outputs information, wherein the home appliance comprises a product identification system and a transmission system the refrigerator's *barcode scanner, communications port* and *Internet connection*, p. 52 col. 3-4); and an interpreting system that interprets lifestyle conditions of the appliance user (p. 53, col. 2, para. 5-8 as marked; the "DRO" feature in col. 3; and the col. 4 discussion of consumer targeting), and a transmission/receiving system that sends/receives advertising and sales promotion information to the home appliance user (*electronic coupons and promotions* at the end of para. 5, and the discussion of automatically filling the refrigerator at para. 3 of col. 1. p. 53).
5. LaPlante does not teach that the advertising/sales promotion information is sent to, and output/displayed at the appliance. Hamano et al. teaches that the advertising/sales promotion information is sent to, and output/displayed at the appliance (para. [0061]).

Because LaPlante teaches that the appliance is a point of sale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the teachings of Hamano et al. to those of LaPlante. The "DRO" feature taught by LaPlante (p. 53 col. 2-3) suggest adjustments at the refrigerator to the user's standing order. Any suggestion that promotes product sales, such as "Would you like to increase your milk order?" reads on sending advertising/sales promotion information.

6. Hamano et al. also teaches a server system for communicating data with the home appliance (para. [0003]).
7. LaPlante also teaches at the citations given above claims: 2, 7 and 11; and claims 5, 9 and 12.
8. LaPlante does not teach (claim 6) that the home appliance will be placed where it is used by a user and the consumption data is input on the side of the appliance. Since the principal common purpose of buying an appliance (refrigerator) is to use it, it is surely obvious to place the home appliance where it is used by a user. Because some users may prefer keypad input to scanner input, and because the appliance side is a convenient place to put the input keypad, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add to the teachings of LaPlante that the consumption data is input on the side of the appliance.
9. Hamano et al. also teaches (claim 4) personalized or targeted information (para. [0010] and [0013]), which reads on optimized information.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 3 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
11. Allowance is further dependent on successful vetting by a "second pair of eyes". Examiner has performed every search deemed reasonable, but does not ask for review of allowable subject matter until applicant indicates willingness to put the application into condition for allowance.

Art Unit: 3622

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the closest prior art, LaPlante, does not teach or suggest compensating the home appliance user commensurate to power consumption of the appliance. Whereas compensating the user for receiving ads would be obvious, tying this compensation to power consumption of the appliance is not. Kikuchi et al. (US 20020128853A1) teaches this inventive feature (para. [0048]), but Kikuchi et al. is not prior art. In response to a request for information under 37 CFR § 1.105, applicant also is not aware of prior art teaching compensating the home appliance user commensurate to power consumption of the appliance (p. 7 of the reply filed on 9 November 2004).

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 5 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at donald.champagne@uspto.gov, and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.
14. The examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber, can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.
15. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant's intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office's web site, www.uspto.gov. At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.



DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Donald L. Champagne
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622